

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDGE STEVEN M. KATZ et. al.,

Defendants.

Case Nos. [22-cv-5344-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5364-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5370-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5388-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5389-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5390-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5394-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5395-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5396-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5397-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5398-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5399-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5400-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5404-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5405-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5430-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5431-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5459-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5460-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5461-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5462-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5464-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5465-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5483-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5484-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5487-PJH](#)

[22-cv-5488-PJH](#)

**ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE
CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

1 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42
2 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas
3 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471
4 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In*
5 *re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

6 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as
7 defendants numerous state and federal judges and county clerks. He seeks relief
8 regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and
9 federal courts.

10 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases,
11 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is
12 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28
13 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case
14 No. 13-0951 CW.

15 The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent
16 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an
17 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512
18 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*
19 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,
20 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with
21 prejudice.

22 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge’s impartiality
23 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings.
24 See *United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate
25 reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases
26 assigned to that judge).

The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 28, 2022



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

T:\PJHALL_psp\2022\Bonilla '22\Bonilla Dismissals13.docx

United States District Court
Northern District of California